

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-25 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 13, 14 and 25 being the independent claims. Claims 2, 3, 5 and 15 have been amended. These changes add no new matter and their entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings because they allegedly did not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In support, the Examiner very generally asserted that "the limitations of claims 1, 13, 14 and 25 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s)." (Office Action, ¶ 4.) The Examiner did not specify which features were missing from the claims, and Applicant is unable to determine which features are allegedly missing.

Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to Figures 23A and 23B. Applicant asserts that each feature of claims 1, 13, 14 and 25 are illustrated therein. If the Examiner disagrees, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner be more specific in identifying the allegedly missing features.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. (Office Action, ¶ 6.) Specifically, the Examiner stated that there was "insufficient antecedent basis" for the "a second connection" feature

in claim 2 because "it is preceded by similar limitation in line 4 of claim 1." The Examiner further asserted that a "similar problem" exists in claims 5 and 15. The Examiner also asserted that there was "insufficient antecedent basis" for the "interfaces" feature in claim 3 because "[i]n claims 1 and 2, first and second interfaces have been recited." The Examiner articulated no specific basis for rejecting claim 4.

Applicant has amended claims 2, 3, 5 and 15 to correct the perceived antecedent basis deficiencies. If the Examiner perceives claim 4 as failing to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner articulate such deficiency in detail. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2-5 and 15 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-8, 13, 14, 18-21 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0075844 to Hagen ("Hagen"). Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner has mischaracterized the teachings of Hagen. In view of the discussion below, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Hagen is directed to a "network access server (NAS)" that, among other things, "provides public network access to mobile terminals through the private network's access point and public network access connection." (Hagen, Abstract.) Furthermore, the NAS "also restricts access by the mobile terminals to the private network, meters network usage by the mobile terminals, and controls use of bandwidth by the mobile terminals." (*Id.*) In effect, the NAS described in Hagen "provides a system and method that enables terminals to access public networks, such as the Internet, ... via fixed, wireline or

wireless network connections, and at geographically dispersed network access points using the existing public network connections of private or proprietary networks." (Hagen, Summary of Invention, ¶ 0010.)

The Examiner specifically asserts that the features of claim 1 are disclosed in Hagen at ¶ 0057. Therein, Hagen describes a preferred embodiment with reference to FIG. 1. In this embodiment, "the NAS 7 is embodied in a general purpose computer having three network interfaces." (Hagen, ¶ 0057.) The first network interface provides connectivity to a plurality of mobile terminals via its associated wireless access points. (*Id.*) The second network interface provides connectivity to the public access network, *i.e.*, the Internet. (*Id.*) The third network interface connects the NAS to the private network, *i.e.*, the private LAN. The LAN operator determines whether and how a mobile device will have access to the private LAN. (*Id.*) The "interfaces" of Hagen thus represent the plurality of connections of the described NAS--*i.e.*, one connection to the mobile terminals via WAPs (*see* FIG. 1, downlink 6); one connection to a public network (*see* FIG. 1, uplink 13); and one connection to a private network or LAN (*see* FIG. 1, interface 8).

According to Hagen, the private network or LAN "may be the internal private corporate network of a local resource provider, *i.e.*, the operator of the network through which the mobile terminal is given access to the public network." (Hagen, ¶ 0057.) The "resource provider" is responsible for determining whether and how a mobile terminal will have access to its private network or LAN. (*Id.*) This is accomplished through use of an "IP filter" or "firewall." (*Id.*) As described in Hagen, "the IP filter or firewall may be configured such that communications to or from IP addresses corresponding to mobile

terminals owned by the resource provider or otherwise permitted to access LAN 10 will be permitted access, whereas communications to or from unknown or foreign IP addresses will not." (*Id.*) In sum, Hagen teaches that whether or not a mobile station is permitted access to the private LAN depends on its IP address and the settings of the IP filter or firewall, as determined by the resource provider.

The method of claim 1, by contrast, describes allowing a station to connect to a network over a first interface. Then, the method describes determining that the same station attempts to access the same network over an interface different from the first interface. The Examiner asserts this feature is accomplished by the "resource provider" of Hagen. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that "the resource provider may determine that in addition to hosting unknown or foreign mobile terminals 1, which are not to provided access to LAN 10, the resource provider will also host mobile terminals 1 which the resource provider owns or for other reasons has determined to provide access to LAN 10." (Office Action, p. 5, ¶ 8; citing to Hagen ¶ 0057.)

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion. There is no indication that the "resource provider" of Hagen first allows a mobile terminal to connect to the private network or LAN over a first interface (e.g., via the NAS), and then determines whether that same mobile terminal is attempting to have a second connection to the private network or LAN over an alternate interface that is different from the first interface. Hagen thus does not teach or suggest "determining that the station [i.e., the mobile terminal of Hagen] is attempting to have a second connection to the network [i.e., the public network or private network] over a second interface other than the first

interface," as recited in claim 1. Indeed, Hagen does not explicitly deal with a scenario where there are multiple interfaces by which single station can access a network.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1. Similarly, Applicant requests that the rejection of dependent claims 2-12 be reconsidered and withdrawn as they depend from a patentable base claim.

The arguments made above with respect to independent claim 1 apply with equal force to independent claims 13, 14 and 25, each of which recite the feature of a station having access to a network via a first interface, and attempting to gain access to the same network via a second, different, interface. For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claims 13, 14 and 25. Similarly, Applicant requests that the rejection of dependent claims 15-24 be reconsidered and withdrawn as they depend from a patentable base claim.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 9 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hagen, in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0195002 to Singhal *et al.* ("Singhal"). The deficiencies of Hagen are not overcome by Singhal. Singhal also does not teach or suggest "determining that the station [i.e., a device 120 of Singhal] is attempting to have a second connection to the network [e.g., via an Handoff Management Points and the Core Server] over a second interface other than the first interface," as recited in claim 1.

For this reason, Applicant also respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 9 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn as these claims each depend from a patentable base claim.

Other Matters

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notification of missing IDS documents. Applicant also wishes to thank the Examiner for an early indication of allowable subject matter. The Examiner noted that claims 10, 11, 23 and 24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. E. Wright', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jon E. Wright
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 50,720

Date: February 28, 2006

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

470044v1